



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

E

A 1,005,869

713

. 378

PROPERTY OF

*The
University of
Michigan
Libraries*

1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

BRYAN OR IMPERIALISM

ADDRESS

BY

THE HON. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL

DELIVERED AT THE

NATIONAL LIBERTY CONGRESS

OF

ANTI-IMPERIALISTS

AT

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

August 15-16, 1900

PUBLISHED BY

THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE

1900



E
713
B78

SPEECH BEFORE THE AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS :

Having in mind the many honors that I have received from my countrymen in times past, I shall, when this day is gone, have no more favorable recollection of any one of them than I shall have of the consideration that you have now extended to me. This is an historical event; this is an historical occasion. If the question before you and before your countrymen is the question of the continuance of this Republic, then no graver question has ever been submitted to an assembly of men, or to a country.

We are opposed to imperialism. We are in favor of a republican form of government. We respect the teachings of our ancestry; we glory in the history they have left to us; and, standing between the past and the future, it is our duty to transmit to posterity, to the generations that are to come, the principles of the fathers and the institutions which they have founded. That is your mission to-day as the representatives of the forty-five States of this Union. This may be a representation without an organized constituency, but it is a representation which speaks for itself, for the people of the country, and for the generations that are advancing to take our places. It is a representation that has a right to speak, a representation that will be heard over the world, speaking as we speak, for the preservation of republican institutions represented in the Republic of America, the light of which, if it shall go out, will never be rekindled on the surface of the earth.

I formulate, in the language of Senator Hoar, the protest that we make against what has been done. The accusation that we prefer against those who have been active in what has been done is this :

We charge that the policy on which this administration has entered will be "the abandonment of the principles on which our government is founded; that it will change our republic into an empire; that our methods of legislation, of diplomacy, of administration, must be hereafter those

which belong to an empire, and not those which belong to republics."

It is our claim that those of us who oppose these propositions are engaged in a warfare against imperialism. The only means before us for the preservation of the Republic, if our allegation is true, is the overthrow of the administration of President McKinley.

I am not disposed to make issues with men, but my friend and fellow-citizen, Mr. Secretary Long, asks the country to accept his opinion that the anti-imperialists are but few in numbers and that they are of no importance. He declares that their voice is only a cry. Yes, this may be so. A census has not been taken. We boast not of numbers.

Nineteen centuries ago there was a cry in the wilderness of Judea, and it was heard by a few only, but now at the end of these nineteen centuries the echoes of its voice and the words of its demand are heard the world over. Although differing in words, our cry corresponds to the cry that was uttered in the wilderness. We demand an open way for justice. We demand freedom, equality, self-government for all mankind.

It is our claim that the way to the enjoyment of these natural rights should be an open way, and that it should be made straight.

This cry is a protest against the imperialism of President McKinley and Secretary Long, and it will follow the centuries in company and in harmony with the cry that was uttered by the herald in the wilderness of Judea.

We are not to be deceived by phrases. The words of wise men are but counters. We look to the reality for the purpose of ascertaining the policy of the government, and from that policy we may decide whether it is imperialistic or not. We have accomplished something already. When Kossuth visited this country, and went to the ancient historic town of Concord, he was received by Mr. Emerson. In his address to the Hungarian exile Mr. Emerson said this: "You have got your story told in every palace and log hut and prairie camp throughout this continent." The Anti-Imperialist Leagues in these last two years have made the word "*imperial*" and the phrase "*imperialistic policy*" known and understood in every palace, in every log cabin, and in every prairie camp on this continent.

It is now two weeks since there appeared in the "Washington Star" — and I hope I misrepresent the character of

the "Star" when I say that it is a supporter of the administration — a letter written by Thomas Jones, a soldier in the Philippine army, to his brother, George Jones, an employee in a bakery in the city of Washington. That letter I am about to read for the purpose of bringing before you the proceedings in the Philippine Islands, and for the purpose of asking you, and asking the country, as far as my voice can be heard, whether or not this letter furnishes evidence of the imperialistic policy of the administration. It is not what the President promises from time to time that gives character and quality to the administration in the Philippines; it is the character of the policy as set forth, coupled with the character of its administration in the region of country in which the policy is put into operation.

Hear what the soldier says :

"I have just returned to Santa Cruz from a two days' trip in the mountains. We left Santa Cruz about 4.30 on the morning of the 5th, and proceeded about twenty miles into the mountains. Men from each troop volunteered to walk five miles further to a house where, we were informed, a Filipino general lived. Besides sixty men, we had two scouts to show us the way. We sneaked through the bushes from place to place, and when we had failed to find the house, or even see any native, we became disgusted, and proceeded to return to Santa Cruz. Just as we were about to turn back we heard a sound of laughter near us, and we started ahead again, and creeping through the bushes, we came in sight of a house. We saw a Filipino officer addressing a crowd of natives. In the house a wedding ceremony was being performed, an insurgent officer taking to himself a better half. During the speech the audience cried out, 'Long live Aguinaldo !' We were about twenty-five yards from the house when the word was given to charge, but not to shoot the children. Most of the party had been indulging in wine, and were not sober. Each soldier took aim, and rushed upon the crowd and fired. Those who escaped took refuge in the building. On the ground near the house were the bodies of the slain, and among them were the bridegroom and the bride, both weltering in their blood."

This statement was published in the city of Washington more than two weeks ago. I have watched the newspapers for the purpose of ascertaining if any notice had been taken of this outrage against humanity. Here were fifty or seventy-five or a hundred persons, men, women,

and children, innocent, as far as was known, of any offence against anybody, enjoying themselves in the most solemn ceremony of life, and sixty men belonging to the army of the United States, and commanded by an officer authorized to speak for the United States, discharged their muskets upon those men, women, children, and the bridegroom and the bride were slain and died weltering in their own blood. As far as we know no notice has been taken of this event. What is the character of that proceeding? Is it in accordance with any system of recognized government?

The President has told the country that there is peace in the Philippines, and that our sixty thousand men are engaged in police duty only. This incident reported by the soldier Jones is evidence of the character of the proceedings that are practised and tolerated in the Philippine Islands. The President's last observation is in the line of such proceedings. What has he said to the country and to the world? "The Philippines are ours, and American authority must be supreme throughout the archipelago. There will be amnesty, broad and liberal, but no abatement of our rights; no abandonment of our duty; there must be no scuttle policy."

As long ago as the fourth day of April, 1899, I delivered an address in the Tremont Temple, Boston, and in that address I made these observations: "I have marshalled a portion of the evidence that is at my command, which proves, or tends to prove, that the President has entered systematically upon a colonial policy in imitation of the colonial policy of England.

"You will observe as I go on that I give no attention to the speeches which the President has made; I follow him by his doings. I give the President credit for ability, for signal ability in his work of transforming this government, and therefore, unless I err in that particular, his policy must be logical. When the actions of men and the language of men appear not to harmonize, I look for the truth in the actions of men." Therefore, from the fourth day of April, 1899, I have not paid any attention to the words of the President as furnishing trustworthy evidence of his purposes.

The protocol, as you remember, of 1898 gave to us a temporary lodging-place in the Philippine Islands. There was no indication in that document that we were to come into the possession of the islands; and yet when the Commission assembled in Paris the President insisted that a

transfer of the islands, *en masse*, should be made to the government of the United States. He assumed, upon the slight hold which he had obtained through the protocol, to demand the surrender of the entire archipelago.

I am not able, nor is any one able, to explain the motives under which President McKinley has acted in the enforcement of his policy. I am of those who believe that he is the master-mind, not only of his Cabinet, but of the Congress of the United States, and that nothing has transpired of importance in connection with his policy except what he himself has originated. The war with Spain was ended with the protocol which he prepared. He interpreted the protocol contrary to the language that was used in it, — the language which he had furnished, — and he deduced from that language the treaty of Paris. He framed the treaty of Paris upon his own ideas; and since the treaty of Paris was ratified by the Senate he has interpreted his powers upon his own theory of what the treaty authorized him to do. Therefore from the first until the present time there has been no authority exercised by any one contrary to his will, and consequently he is the one person who is responsible first of all for what has been done. If we are opposed to what has been done, our first and chief duty, and the only duty in the performance of which we can attain any desirable result, is the overthrow of the administration of which he is the head.

The Congress of the United States passed a resolution April 19, 1898, in regard to Cuba, and though it has been often read, it should be brought to the mind of an assembly like this. The fourth provision reads thus: "The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people." An event has occurred recently which has not attracted special notice. It is a regulation made by General Wood in regard to taxation. That regulation provides that the estates in Cuba are to be taxed, not according to their salable value in the market, but according to the opinion of appraisers as to the value of those estates if they were worked up to their full capacity. This decree is contrary to every rule and principle of taxation in civilized countries. There can be but one purpose in that rule, and that is to tax the present owners of estates in Cuba, who have become impoverished by the revolutions there, out

of their estates and possessions. The estates will thus pass into the hands of men who will coöperate in what has been the purpose, from the first, of a large body of men in this country, and another body in Cuba, namely, to place the island in such a condition as to compel its annexation to the United States.

During the past few days there has been put forth a statement of five conditions that are to be required in the new constitution that the people of Cuba are to be authorized to prepare.

1. The foreign relations of Cuba are to be managed through the American government at Washington.

2. Cuba to have no power to declare war without the consent of the United States.

3. The United States government to have a veto power over legislation increasing the Cuban debt beyond certain limits to be arranged for in the new constitution.

4. The United States to have a certain well-defined supervision over the Cuban treasury.

5. The United States to retain for a period of years, if not indefinitely, control of the fortifications which command the port of Havana and other important places on the island.

These stipulations have a semi-official appearance in the "Boston Herald" of July 25, 1900.

Now, gentlemen, how do these conditions accord with the promise that the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the country, made to the people of Cuba on the nineteenth day of April, 1898?

The troubles in China have been aggravated, and the missionaries in China and the ambassadors of the various governments of the world have been put in peril, by the policy of the United States. What is the history of the last ten years in reference to China? Is it not true that in that period of time there have been suggestions again and again made that it was the purpose of the states of Europe—England always being included—to partition China and appropriate its provinces to the different countries of the world? When we entered into the Philippines it was the additional menace to the Chinese Empire that has led to the revolution in China, and involved the missionaries of the different countries of the world, and the ambassadors of the countries of the world, in peril of their lives. Senator Lodge's claim is evidence that our presence in the Philippines was a menace to the integrity of China. He asks this question: "Where would our consuls and our

missionaries and our merchants and our traders and our ministers have looked for protection if we had never heard of the Philippines?" I add a question: If our presence in the Philippines furnishes standing-ground for a relief expedition, does it not also furnish standing-ground for every form of hostile demonstration? And I ask this further question: If from 1890 the states of Europe, including England, had uttered threatening menaces to the integrity of this Republic, what would be the condition of the mind of America, if, in this year of 1900, it should come to pass that the Emperor of Germany, with the approval of England and the silent acquiescence of all Europe, had seized the island of San Domingo and Hayti? A parallel condition of affairs existed in China at the opening of the year 1900. The fact that we were in the Philippines was a contribution to the revolutionary spirit in China which led to the peril of the missionaries and the ambassadors. Thus has our nation contributed to the difficulties which it is now attempting to meet by a military movement under officers of different countries, and without any organized means of acting in harmony. I ask two questions: Are General Chaffee and General Grant to be put under the lead of a prince of Germany? Or, on the other hand, is the government of the United States to take upon itself the peril of allowing one of its officers to assume command of the troops of England and France and Germany, and thus be responsible for mistakes in the administration of military affairs, or to become responsible for alleged mistakes?

If in the month of June we had treated China as we should have treated Great Britain under similar circumstances, there would have been no considerable difficulty. If to-night news should come to this country that there was an outbreak in London and that our minister was in peril of his life, should we undertake to send a military expedition up the Thames River? No; we should appeal through the legitimate diplomatic channels to the authorities of Great Britain, for the purpose of ascertaining the circumstances before we commenced a war. Acting in a contrary manner we made no effort to reach Peking through diplomatic channels. We engaged in a military undertaking, and through that undertaking, whether we participated directly in the act or not, the guns of the allies — we being one — were trained upon a citadel of the Chinese Empire. And was not the act an act of war? If not war, what was it? And who authorized the move-

ment in the presence of the Constitution of the United States, which asserts that Congress only can declare war? Can the chief magistrate make war in the absence of a Congressional declaration of war, and justify himself by declaring that it is not war? I suppose that if I now say anything in justification of the Chinese policy, somebody in Washington will say that I have spoken in a manner not agreeable to the authorities of this country, and prejudicial to our policy abroad. I have a word to say upon that subject. The American people will speak for liberty, for justice, even though the words of liberty and justice may kindle or may inflame the fires of liberty the world over. China is a vast country; it has a tenth of the habitable globe within its jurisdiction. It has existed six thousand years, and, as far as we know, it has obeyed that maxim of the law which has come out of the remote ages: "Use that which is your own so as not to injure that which is another's!" A great maxim, which, when applied to the affairs of men, contains every provision of the decalogue that is not purely dogmatic. In these six thousand years, and in obedience to that maxim, China has existed. Assyria, Egypt, Macedonia, Carthage, Rome, Venice, Holland, and now Spain, have withered and died. Died because they took into their possession that to which they had no right. And it is to such an entertainment that we are invited. Such is the history that these nations have furnished for the contemplation of the world through all the future ages, — it is to such a history that our eyes are turned by this administration, and we are asked to imitate those nations.

When Great Britain within the last month appealed to us for a loan — this empire of three centuries that has been warring against the weaker peoples of the earth and appropriating their earnings to its own use — when Great Britain comes to us at the close of the nineteenth century to ask us, who one hundred and twenty-five years ago resisted successfully its attempts to subject us to its imperial authority, and bows itself to us and asks for a loan, who does not see in that one step of submission to circumstances, in obedience to a fate which she cannot resist, that the day of her downfall is approaching? None of us will live to the end of the coming century, but at the end of the twentieth century it may not surprise those who may then be alive that England is but the imitator of Spain — dying as an empire. And we are asked to follow her example, to tread in her footsteps, knowing

that those steps are leading the British Empire to destruction. Now is the time, the only time, that the people of this country can arrest this scheme of empire ruin. The laboring people are the men to whom we appeal. I have no hostility to wealth, I have no great fear of trusts, so long as the people are true to their own rights and assert their supreme, ultimate authority in public affairs. All the evils of an inflated currency, of trusts, of railroad combinations, every evil of policy in finance, can be reached through the action of an intelligent public, but if we accept imperialism, which means that one set of people shall do the thinking and the rest shall do the working, and that those who do the thinking shall divide the fruits of what the workingmen earn, — if such is to be the policy of the country, then, of course, liberty cannot be saved.

I understand that already there is a movement in the negro race of the North to abandon the Republican party; and that there is also a purpose, on the part of the Republican leaders, to employ ministers and others to influence the negro population to remain true to the Republican party. I am to assume something for myself. If there is any man living who has a right to speak to the negro population of this country, I am that man. They may not owe anything to me or to anybody else. I ask nothing of them. But I say this: If the negro race have not learned to love liberty for the sake of liberty, and to hate despotism because it is despotism, and without any relation to the fact whether they suffer from despotism, then their freedom during five and thirty years has been a failure. If they are not for liberty for all mankind, then they are not for liberty for any. If men only hate despotism when they are the subjects of despotism, then they deserve despotism. We should hate despotism and resist it, not for ourselves only, but for everybody. I say to the negro population of the North: Men of your color, eight or ten million of them in the Philippine Islands, are denied the right of self-government. For the time being they are the subjects of military leaders. I call upon you to stand up for the rights of other men as other men have stood up for your rights.

One of the peculiar arguments in behalf of this administration is this: In the States of Mississippi and Georgia and the Carolinas the negroes are suffering under unjust laws, and they are the victims of persecution. That being the case, no negro should say one word against

the oppression of the colored race in the Philippines. This is the argument of the administration. I say this to the negroes of the North: If you wish to satisfy the people of Mississippi and Alabama and Georgia and the Carolinas that you are worthy to be their equals, to stand in your places as men, and take your just part, and share in the government of the States where you live, show them now that you have a sentiment of justice in your hearts, that you are ready to make some sacrifices, if need be, for the purpose of overthrowing a government in this country that is persecuting the colored race in another country. If the injustice of the South toward the negro were ten times as great as it is, it would not justify Mr. McKinley and his associates in destroying liberty among ten million people who were never guilty of any wrong, even the least, to him or to the country.

I am to say a few words upon the subject of prosperity. I am one of those who believe that there is something fully as valuable in this world as money. I have as many reasons for liking money as any one can have who has lived eighty years. I have always needed it, and I have never had enough at any one time to supply the pressing needs that were upon me and upon my family. But I have gone on, and I have learned one thing. A friend of mine, an eminent member of the bar, in his advanced years, and when he had accumulated a considerable fortune, said this: "When I began life I thought the main thing was to get money, and I have got it, and it is a very convenient thing to have it, but it isn't exactly what I thought it was when I began." That remark should be remembered by the young. Money is a convenient thing to have, but you may pay too much for it, and that is what this government is asking us to do. We are paying for prosperity through war more than prosperity is ever worth, and without security for its ultimate attainment by us.

We began in February, 1899, the conquest of the Philippines. It is a great misfortune for the country that General Otis has left the islands. He could assure us every week that the Filipinos were conquered. General McArthur does not give us this satisfaction. He says nothing and the newspapers are under the censor. On the first of January, 1900, the President said we had peace; yet the call is for more troops. Prosperity which is worth having is that prosperity which comes by honest labor, by honest dealings with associates and friends,

and by doing what ought to be done to, and with, and by, other people. Mr. Webster once said, "If a thing can be done an ingenious man tell how?" If Governor Roosevelt can satisfy me that it is right to go into the Philippine Islands and kill those who will not submit to our rule and who will not agree that we shall have our own way in all their affairs, I might support this administration.

What has the administration done for prosperity? I am to give the administration credit. I am a protectionist; I voted for McKinley in 1896, and largely on that ground. I was anxious that the country should have the benefit of what we called protection. I have no doubt that the Dingley tariff has done a great deal to advance the country in a pecuniary way. Good crops in the West have done more. We may get a fact of some value from the history of the cotton crops of the South. I was young in 1861 and I ventured on a prophecy. In December of 1861 gentlemen who had extreme opinions on the side of emancipation asked me to deliver an address in Tremont Temple, Boston. At that time emancipation was not popular. I made a speech, and I have read that speech recently to refresh my memory. In it I said, "If you will abolish slavery in the South and let the negroes become free men and go to work, they will, before this century closes, increase the crop of cotton from four million bales — which it then was — to eight million bales." The crop has reached ten million bales, and I am one of the few prophets in politics who can quote his own words. Much of our prosperity has come from the freedom of the negro, an event which antedates this administration.

A few years ago New England was very much excited over the possibility that its manufacturing industries might be transferred to the South, as labor was cheaper there than it was in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and other manufacturing States. I thought with the rest that there was some peril, but I took this view of it: We are one country, the South has as good a right as the North to make a yard of cotton cloth. I said, "Go on. We will continue to manufacture in the North, or if we are conquered in one line we shall turn our attention to something else. We will contend for equality even if we cannot command supremacy." Our experience with the South is an object lesson. Who will answer for prosperity in America when manufactories and shops may be set up in Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines with freedom in trade with the United States?

We have gone on in the contest with the South without serious injury. We have now entered into a war with China. Everything that this administration does ought to turn to the advantage of the country in the matter of prosperity. So it is claimed, but the markets of China are closed to the products of our industry, and the wheels in Lowell, and Biddeford, Me., and in Fall River, to some extent, have ceased to turn because of the trouble in China. How long is this trouble to continue? Is it war? It is not peace. How happy it will be for us, having a footing in the Philippines, if we can make draft after draft upon the young men of the country! How fortunate for the nation that it can employ the young men of the country to fight the battles of empire in China and close the market of four hundred million people to our products! Is there a man rash enough to say that we can take Cuba, and Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands into our jurisdiction, and resist the double force that will be applied for the free introduction of the products of their industry into the United States? A vast number in the United States will demand the business, and the whole population of the islands will be anxious for the benefit of our markets. What will be the condition of the laboring population, the men on the farms and in the shops, when the ports of Cuba, of Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands are free for the outcoming of the products of their industries? Who does not see that, even if you can keep the natives of the tropics out of the United States, and save our people from actual physical competition, nevertheless the products of their industries are to come into competition with the products of our laboring people. This will be true whether the islands are held as dependencies or accepted as equals. I am not anxious to be counted as the particular defender of the interests of labor. I know, however, that when the laboring people of a country are prostrate, when they cannot see, as the sun sets at night, the prospect of a happy day on the morrow, that the people are suffering a form of degradation which in the end will reduce them to the condition of serfs. We should strive to preserve the laboring population of the country. We should strive to create generations of intelligent young men and women, who, coming out of our common schools and entering into the contests of life, shall find open avenues to comfort and prosperity through honest industry. If we are brought into contact with the millions of laborers in the East, our

laboring population will be degraded to the condition of the people of the East. From the first I have looked to the laboring classes, to the millions that get their bread by the sweat of their faces, for the overthrow of this administration. I know — I don't need to see Mr. Hanna's check-books — I know that he is gathering in means and money to advance the cause of the administration. The laboring people have this question in their own control. They are the major part of the voters of the country. If they are not for justice, if they are not for liberty as a principle, if they are not for humanity in the islands as well as at home ; if they are not for any of these moral and equitable considerations, let them now make a stand for themselves, and deposit their ballots on the theory that they are protecting themselves against free competition with the unclad and cheaply fed millions in the East.

How is this to be done? I have no disguises. In my youth I turned aside and left the old Democratic party when it surrendered itself to slavery. I leave the Republican party in my age, now that it has surrendered itself to imperialism and tyranny. I helped to create the Republican party because I believed it was a party of justice and liberty and honesty. I now believe that it is a party of injustice and of despotism, and I will help to destroy it. And how? There is but one available means. You know what it is. When President Lincoln thought that a change in the command of the army was necessary he placed "Fighting Joe" Hooker at the head of the Army of the Potomac, and he wrote to him thus: "I have heard that you have said that I ought to proclaim myself Dictator. I have not appointed you to the command of the Army of the Potomac because of that remark, but in spite of it." He thought that Hooker could command the Army of the Potomac and so aid more than any one else in the suppression of the Rebellion, and he overlooked the words of the hero of many battles.

I am for Bryan in spite of what he has said, and in spite of what he may believe concerning the currency or the finances of the country. The question to which we invite the country is a question of life or death for the Republic. And shall we stop to consider whether silver ought to be worth more or less than it is now worth? If a mistake is made in the next administration, should Mr. Bryan come to the head, the people can change the policy in four or eight years. The country isn't to be destroyed. If the

credit of the country should be impaired by his administration — which I do not anticipate — cannot we redeem it? Wasn't it impaired during the Civil War, when a dollar of gold would bring \$2.80 in the currency of the country? And haven't we redeemed it? And have we not increased our resources? We are told that we are now the centre of the world in money matters; that England is our debtor. Every domestic error may be remedied. A policy of war and foreign conquest has no limits but the surface of the globe. If a man has been deceived and he continues to repose confidence in that deceiver and he is deceived again, he has no right to complain. His misfortunes are due to his own stupidity and infatuation. If you have not been deceived and your confidence is given to one who appears well, to one who promises to do what you wish to have done, and you have no reason to suspect him of duplicity in the business, you are not blamable if you trust him. Mr. Bryan to me stands in that position. He appears to be a man of character—I have not heard even his enemies say anything against his character. In this city he has made the most explicit promises to pursue the policy which we advocate. I am disposed to trust him. Turn now to the other side. In my opinion the President has promised many things, and he has done several things that do not harmonize with his promises. But now he pledges himself to pursue a policy which we condemn. If we vote for him we have no right to complain if he shall pursue that policy. I believe Mr. Bryan is as honest in his purpose to redeem the country from its degradation and its policy of imperialism as any man who sits on this platform or in this audience to-day. Therefore, for one, I am in favor of supporting Mr. Bryan in spite of his belief in things concerning which he has not my concurrence.

Finally, gentlemen, we are about to separate. We are to make a platform which will, I suppose, contain two or three declarations. It will contain a declaration against the administration. I trust that it will contain also a declaration to support Mr. Bryan. Beyond this we are to continue the work in which we have been engaged. We are not welded to the Democratic party; we are coöperating for the purpose of overthrowing this administration. We shall do what we can. We have done much already.

I hope I shall not offend anybody by introducing an illustration from the ecclesiastical side of affairs. When the "Harper's New Monthly," as it is called, was first

published, I received the impression that the managers thought they had power enough to destroy the Catholic church. They brought out cartoons adverse to that church. One of the cartoons represented the close of a convent school term, where the girls from Protestant families had been educated. The lady superior and a priest were standing by. The priest was represented as saying to the lady superior, "You haven't made Catholics of these girls." "No," said she, "we have not, but we have spoiled them for Protestants." I cannot say from any knowledge at my command that we have converted a great many Republicans, but we have spoiled great numbers of Republicans, as aids to the Republican party on the platform of imperialism.

Let us proceed with our work, and upon the theory that we are to triumph. Let there be no half-heartedness in this business. Let every man do what he can. If he has money he can give it where it will enable the Leagues to print and distribute documents — not this speech, but some other speeches that will do good. There is no limit to the demand for what we call literature. Probably a great deal of it does not rise to that dignity, but it answers a purpose. It causes people to think. Thus it may come to pass that next March you may have an inauguration to be followed by a policy which will bring our troops out of the islands of the sea; a policy that will bring the boys home to their mothers' arms; a policy in which the death-roll will be diminished, and a policy by which the massacre of innocent people who never did us any harm will come to an end. Finally we may set up three republics upon the islands of the sea that shall glory in their origin, through the policy of the American people, by which they have been raised from a condition of servitude into an opportunity to govern themselves, to enjoy the fruits of their own industry, and to decide for themselves what their public policy shall be.

